



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/802,141

03/17/2004

Nagesh Sonti

215P011709-US (PAR)

3267

2512

7590

03/18/2008

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

KESSLER, CHRISTOPHER S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/802,141	Applicant(s) SONTI ET AL.	
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER KESSLER	Art Unit 1793	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHRISTOPHER KESSLER.

(3) Dr Nagesh Sonti.

(2) ____.

(4) Mr Bill Knotts.

Date of Interview: 27 February 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Dr. Sonti described test results from gears fabricated with the instant invention in comparison to conventional gears.

Claim(s) discussed: 19 and 35.

Identification of prior art discussed: Amateau.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the differences between the prior art process and the process of the instant invention. Applicant argues that the mechanical property data should be included as unexpected results. The Examiner noted that any evidence showing unexpected results should compare the invention to the closest prior art. The Examiner suggested ways that the claims might be amended to distinguish over the prior art process.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Christopher Kessler/
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required